1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Larry A. Hammond, 004049 Anne M. Chapman, 025965 OSBORN MALEDON, P.A. 2929 N. Central Avenue, 21st Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793 (602) 640-9000 lhammond@omlaw.com achapman@omlaw.com  John M. Sears, 005617 P.O. Box 4080 Prescott, Arizona 86302	2010 AUG 13 PM 2: 08 JEANNE HICKS, GLERK  2. Adams  BY:	
8 9	(928) 778-5208 John.Sears@azbar.org		
10	Attorneys for Defendant		
11			
12	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI		
13			
14	STATE OF ARIZONA,	) No. P1300CR20081339	
15	Plaintiff,	) Div. 6	
16	vs.	) RESPONSE TO STATE'S	
17	STEVEN CARROLL DEMOCKER,	<ul><li>) MOTION TO QUASH</li><li>) SUBPOENAS DUCES TECUM</li></ul>	
18	Defendant.	)	
19	Defendant.	)	
20		)	
21		,	
22	Steven DeMocker, by and through cou	insel, hereby responds to the State's	
23	Motion to Quash Subpoenas Duces Tecum and requests that this Court deny the State's		
24	Motion. This response is based on the due process clause, the confrontation clause, the		
25	right to a fair trial, and the Eighth Amendment as well as Arizona counterparts, Arizona		
26	Rules of Evidence, Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure and the following		
27	Memorandum of Points and Authorities.		

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

On July 27, 2010, the defense served subpoenas duces tecum to the Yavapai County Sheriff's Office and Yavapai County Human Resources Department for certain job-related personnel records for YCSO employees Luis Huante, John McDormett and Doug Brown. On August 5, 2010, the State filed a Motion to Quash these subpoenas.

The defense had previously requested these records from the Yavapai County Sheriff's Office in 2009. In response, the Sheriff's Office disclosed only training records and directed the defense to the County Human Resources Department for the remainder of the records.

As a result, the defense served subpoenas duces tecum to both the Yavapai County Sheriff's Office and Yavapai County Human Resources Department for the remainder of the records.

I. The County Human Resources Department Records Do Not Fall Under Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 15.1 and a Subpoena is Therefore Appropriate.

As the State's Motion to Quash acknowledges, the State's duty to disclose records under Rule 15.1 extends to the prosecutors office, law enforcement agencies and others participating in the investigation or evaluation of the case. *See* Ariz. R. Crim P. 15.1(f). The County Human Resources Department does not fall within any of these categories. Therefore, under Rule 15.1 the State is not obligated to provide these documents to the defense. Because Rule 15.1 does not apply to these documents a subpoena duces tecum under ARS 13-4071(d) issued to the County Human Resources Department is and was appropriate. For these reasons, the State's Motion to Quash the subpoena to the County Human Resources Department should be denied.

## II. If Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 15.1 Does Apply to the Yavapai County Human Resources Department Records, the Defense Requests an Order Under Rule 15.1(g) for the Requested Records

During the course of this investigation, YCSO employee Luis Huante was demoted and YCSO employee Doug Brown was removed as the case agent in this case. Witness testimony has evidenced a disagreement between Mr. Huante and Commander Mascher about the reason for Doug Brown's removal as case agent. Furthermore, YCSO employee John McDormett, who was the case agent appointed after Doug Brown's removal, was designated as the case agent by the County Attorney for the trial. However, Capt. Rhodes replaced him.

The State is well aware of these facts so the assertion in its Motion that this request for records is a "fishing expedition" is disingenuous. The State is required to disclose *Brady* material but the defense doesn't have to rely on its judgment to decide what might be *Brady*. The defense is entitled to conduct its own, independent, investigations. Therefore, the defense has a right to review the personnel and disciplinary records of these YCSO employees and what those records demonstrate about the relationship of these personnel decisions to the investigation and activities in this case.

If the Court determines that the Sheriff's Office subpoena should be quashed because the State is obligated to disclose the records under Rule 15.1, the defense requests an order under Rule 15.1(g) directing the State to disclose the following records with respect to Huante, McDormett and Brown:

- 1. Annual performance appraisals and ratings since 2005.
- 2. Documentation of voluntary or involuntary demotions since 2005.
- 3. Documentation of paid or unpaid suspensions since 2005.
- 4. Rate-of-pay history since hire date.
- 5. Records of all personnel actions taken since hire date.
- 6. All citizen complaints founded and unfounded since 2005.

4

10

9

1112

1314

15

1617

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

- 7. All internal investigations sustained and unstained since hire date.
- 8. All "work-station notes" or equivalent documents/records created by supervisors regarding the employee performance, since 2005.
- 9. All correspondence with the employee regarding performance, including any performance counseling memorandums, verbal counseling, written reprimands, or corrective action recommended and/or taken since 2005.

As the State's Motion admits, the Court can order "any person" to make available needed materials or information, after a showing that the "defendant has substantial need in the preparation of the defendant's case for material or information not otherwise covered by Rule 15.1, and that the defendant is unable without undue hardship to obtain the substantial equivalent by other means ...." Ariz. R. Crim. P. 15.1(g). This showing has been made by the circumstances described above, the Sheriff's Office's refusal to provide these records pursuant to a request, and the State's objection to the present subpoena. As trial is underway, the need for this information is immediate. The defense hereby requests that if the Court determines that these records are covered by Rule 15.1, it order the State to disclose these documents under Rule 15.1(g) pursuant to the demonstrated need. See e.g. State ex rel. Dean v. City Court of City of Tucson, 140 Ariz. 75, 680 P.2d 211 (App. Div. 2 1984) (finding city police department's internal affairs records of arresting officer were subject to in camera inspection and disclosure in criminal prosecution in order to inquire into defense contention that arresting officer had a well-known reputation for being less than truthful while testifying and in trying to justify unprofessional conduct while in the field.)

## **CONCLUSION**

Defendant Steven DeMocker, by and through counsel, hereby requests that this Court deny the State's Motion to Quash or, in the alternative, order the requested documents disclosed pursuant to Rule 15.1(g).

1	DATED this 13th day of August, 2010.	
2		1
3	By:	Tabel M. Soors
4		John M. Sears P.O. Box 4080
5		Prescott, Arizona 86302
6		OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.
7		Larry A. Hammond
8		Anne M. Chapman 2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
9		Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793
10		Attorneys for Defendant
11		
12	ORIGINAL of the foregoing hand delivered for	
13	filing this day of August, 2010, with:	
14	Jeanne Hicks	
15	Clerk of the Court Yavapai County Superior Court	
16	120 S. Cortez	
17	Prescott, AZ 86303	
18	<b>COPIES</b> of the foregoing hand delivered this	
19	this 13th day of August, 2010, to:	
20	The Hon. Warren R. Darrow	
21	Judge Pro Tem B 120 S. Cortez	
22	Prescott, AZ 86303	
23	Joseph C. Butner, Esq.	
24	Jeffrey Paupore, Esq. Prescott Courthouse basket	
25	1 165con Courmouse basket	
26		
27	My Man	
28	3247783	
	5	